

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,035	06/23/2003	David N. Kermoade	33420	1034
23589	7590 03/18/2005		EXAM	INER
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP 2405 GRAND BLVD., SUITE 400 KANSAS CITY, MO 64108			SEMBER, THOMAS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,		2875	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		• •
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
A 11	10/604,035	KERMOADE, DAVID N. ()
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas M. Sember	2875
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOTHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statent of the second of the s	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rejunication.) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty tutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT will, by statute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on <u>19 <i>November 2003</i></u> .	•
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2	b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition f closed in accordance with the practic	•	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the appear 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-6 and 13-27 is/are rejecte 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 7-12 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restrict	e withdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any object		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including 11) The oath or declaration is objected to		•
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim f a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority of	for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § documents have been received.	119(a)-(d) or (f).
2. Certified copies of the priority of3. Copies of the certified copies of	documents have been received in Aport the priority documents have been to hall Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	_	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P[*] 		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date
Notice of Dransperson's Patient Drawing Review (P Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or I Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>090203</u> .		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-6, 13-16, 19-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vickers (figures 7-11). Vickers (figures 7-11) discloses a backlit display system comprising a first (32) and second (33) light-transmissive side panels hingedly (57) coupled to one another along a juncture. A first outer end panel (34) hingedly coupled to one of the side panels proximate a first end of the juncture and a second outer end panel (35) hingedly coupled to one of the side panels proximate a second end of the juncture. When assembled the side panels for a generally V-shaped configuration. Regarding the functional language of claims 13-16, 19-23 and 26, even though welding or adhesive is used to secure the panels of Vickers, the apparatus of Vickers is still capable of being shiftable between a collapsed and an assembled configuration. Furthermore, the display is zero degrees in relationship to a horizontal surface when in its collapsed state and the side panels are approximately 45 degrees from a horizontal surface while the end panels are approximately 90 degrees from a horizontal surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-6, 13-16 and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pawelka. Pawelka discloses a backlit display system comprising a first (7) and second (8) light-transmissive side panels hingedly coupled to one another along a juncture. A first outer end panel hingedly coupled to one of the side panels proximate a first end of the juncture and a second outer end panel (13) hingedly coupled to one of the side panels proximate a second end of the juncture. Regarding the functional language of claims 13-17 and 19-32, the apparatus of Pawelka is shiftable between a collapsed and an assembled configuration. Furthermore, the display is zero degrees in relationship to a horizontal surface when in its collapsed state and the side panels are approximately 45 degrees from a horizontal surface while the end panels are approximately 90 degrees from a horizontal surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 10/604,035

Art Unit: 2875

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Vickers or Pawelka). (Vickers or Pawelka) discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching of the specific thickness when the display system is in its collapsed configuration. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the display systems of (Vickers or Pawelka) so as the conform to applicant's specific dimensions since the Federal Court has held that a mere recitation of relative dimension that would not perform differently than the prior art device would not make applicant's device patentably distinct.

In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

Furthermore, applicant's claimed dimension would merely be obvious engineering design choice and applicant has not stated any unexpected results in making the display system a specific dimension and it appears the display systems of of (Vickers or Pawelka) would perform equally well at providing a relatively thin and easily foldable display system.

Application/Control Number: 10/604,035 Page 5

Art Unit: 2875

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 7-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas M. Sember whose telephone number is 571-272-2381. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 A.M- 5.30 p.m. first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 703-305-4939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas M Sember

THOMAS M. SEMBER